
HAYDAR KUTLU

GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE CPT CC

**The Communist Party
of Turkey and
the Struggle
for Democracy**

Supplement to

Information Bulletin of the CPT

HAYDAR KUTLU
GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE CPT CC

**THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF TURKEY AND
THE STRUGGLE
FOR DEMOCRACY**

**This article is published in july 1985 issue of
the quarterly organ of the CPT, "Yol ve Amaç".**

There are developments taking place in our country, that at a first glance make astonishing effects. In fact the number of those who are surprised are not very little. Some try to hide their astonishment with a pedantry, just prefer to say "these are known things". Some prefer to close their eyes to the phenomena by saying "there is nothing new in the Western front".

The history once more proceeds at a full speed without waiting the comments of the "commentators", prepares the comments of the events from today. It prepares numerous materials for whom are able to see them. Despite those who try to reverse it and despite various interpretations of the "commentators", the wheels of the history advances. There are some periods that drag forward those who want to stop the progress of the history. We are living through such a period in Turkey.

By making a dialectical materialist interpretation of the history, Marx thought us that the world is not only in need of interpretation but essentially to be changed. To be a revolutionary means to find the ways of a change the situation and to change it.

Today almost every one has a same opinion on the matter of the general interpretation of the present situation. Except the fascist dictatorship and its step by step decreasing number of ilks, no one can talk about existence of democracy in the country.

The dictatorship made efforts to convince the people and the whole world by means of a constitution, a puppet parliament and a so-called government which is nothing else but a gang of plunderers, that now a democratic regime exists in Turkey. But all its efforts were unsuccessful.

Today, it is impossible to talk about softening of the regime. On the contrary its further toughening remains as a serious threat. The CPT always drew attentions to this danger and to the pacifist dreams. If you can not identify correctly the supporting forces of the regime and its levers, you can not recognize the development, the contradictions it embraces, therefore can not design a plan for the battle.

THE FASCIST DICTAT WILL NOT COLLAPSE BY ITSELF

It should not be forgotten that fascism does not mean a simple change in the political regime but a radical change in the structure of the state and a definite move backwards in the economical, political, social and cultural life of the society. But definitions alone are not that important. Perhaps one should put aside the definitions first and look at the real phenomena. The phenome-

na affirming our above mentioned statement and open indications can be found extensively in our plenary meeting reports and in ATILIM.

Therefore what should be noted first that the situation will not be changed that easily, the democracy desired by the people will not be achieved easily. Without the broadest unity of the democratic forces, without realization of a nation wide resistance the fascist dictatorship can not be overthrown. The conditions for a nation wide resistance and for a mass popular movement has not matured yet, the dictatorship has not totally lost the bridle.

There are two incorrect attitudes becoming apparent in the left who see this reality. Firstly, as if it is possible to draw the masses into the struggle just by appeals or as we have entered into the state of a raise in the struggle of the masses, to put forward such tactics that can only be implemented in a circumstance when the revolutionary process is elevated. Shortly that is a revolutionary phrase mongering. And secondly, moving from the allegation that the left does not have a role to play in overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, instead of talking about the tasks of the present, deals with the next stage of the struggle. Both arrive at the same end, remaining idle and not being able to lead the masses concretely.

The policy of the CPT is completely different. While pointing out that the situation will not be changed easily, we did not stop there. Following the explanation of the necessity of a nation wide resistance, we have warned our party organisations not to turn it into an empty slogan (unfortunately, from time to time we still observe that sufficient attention is not paid to this warning).

Some thought that the policy of a national dialogue we put forward later contradicted with the task of a nation wide resistance. Here we should accept that there is a share of our own shortcomings. did not make satisfactory explanations in time. We did not show correlations in our political tactics.

The tactic of the CPT is the revolutionary tactic of a period of reaction, with other words, a Leninist tactic. Without understanding the Leninist foundations of the revolutionary tactics of the period of reaction, it is impossible to understand the tactics of the CPT.

Understanding of our views may not be that important for the others. But the more important, if the Marxist left wants to be successful, it should take into consideration this point.

In order to do that one should get out of the ivory towers. It is necessary to think over and to reply the following two questions without any hesitation: From the point of class struggle, are we in a period of reaction or are we in a state of a revolutionary uprising? Answers such as "at any moment, there can be a mass explosion, the situation can be changed and a revolutionary situation can rise" may only be the response of those who are not living through the developments but observing them from outside. A concrete analysis of a concrete case and then production of revolutionary tactics for the struggle of the working class; This can not be the stand of those who claim to be the vanguard. The second question: What is the present position of the working class in the society, and of the left among the working class, among the working people, what about the driving power of the working class? Without giving realistic replies to this question, the tactics of a battle against the enemy can not be prepared. Without giving an answer, having dreams about a mass explosion does not suit us.

If there is such an explosion, surely we change our tactics right away. Our

task however is by trying to mature the conditions and to relieve it from its potential state and make real, to organize it from today and to be able to prevent its suppression when it has been realized. The communists never forget the great significance of the spontaneous actions of the masses. But they neither attach themselves to the spontaneous actions of the masses spontaneous actions of the masses.

THE WAY OF GAINING STRENGTH

It will be better to make a parenthesis at this point and deal with a matter. The left, including us frequently repeat the following statement: "the objective factors are matured what is needed is the subjective factor". If it is said for a strategical period, this elaboration is correct. But as it is repeated frequently, we understand that it is being used for the present period. Then it is wrong. With other words: "there is the flour and sugar, but why can't we bake a cake?" The actual situation is not really so. A correct observation shows us the tendency of development of the objective factors and moving from this point we talk about "a maturity in general". On the other hand, very truly, we have been saying that the significance of the subjective factor has grown. But, starting from this with a mechanical interpretation and arriving at the conclusion that today the revolution or socialism has objectively matured among the working class and the only task is to organise it is not realistic at all. (Not only because of the present period of reaction, but due to insufficiency of both objective and subjective conditions of the strategical stage).

Objective and subjective factors are dialectically interdependent and interacted. They can not be separated. As it is not understood so, the questions of "strength" and "gaining strength" are not grasped well by the left. We are confined to a dilemma created by ourselves. In a way that is same as saying: "We do not have sufficient strength therefore we can not undertake the present tasks. If you say, we should undertake, then you must show the strength".

Such an understanding means not being able to see the source of strength and its mechanism, therefore to be doomed to a weakness. And again in such an understanding why a political tactic is necessary becomes blurt.

As a matter of fact, in the left movement confusion of strategy with the tactics, to put it better, giving almost no importance for the tactical struggle, wandering around the strategy is not a new situation. On the issue of strategy, the left always has been frightened about stages. While repeating that the socialist revolution is a single process with two stages because the books say so, in reality it could not assimilate the fact.

The political tactics are necessary for us to make required manoeuvres to the enemy which is yet stronger than us, to win the intermediary battles, to accumulate strength for the ultimate struggle or for getting strengthened. Today everyone who says it is necessary "to become stronger", must understand that it is reinforcement of the struggle of the working class, of the masses prior to the numerical strength. One aspect of the raising the struggle of the masses is "successfully and correctly" realization of organisational work of the communist party among the masses, and the other (that makes the organisation easier) is a policy to be put forward by the party, that helps the balance of political

forces to be changed in favour of the progressive forces, to show the masses what their immediate political tasks are, to step up their political education. There are two new factors here: Consciousness and organisation. An organised action rises on these foundations.

In the period of reaction, a political tactic has three important elements. First, paying attention to make use of the internal contradictions of the ruling classes, secondly, to care about if masses learn through their own experiences, and thirdly, try to increase the actions of the active forces outside the working class and draw them closer to the working class. We do not add to these elements already known facts, the always valid principle that the policy should concentrate and unite all opposition movements which arouse in the society with different reasons. We should note however this feature of the politics has a particular significance in the period of reaction.

During the period of reaction, inner contradictions of the bourgeoisie, the contradictions that have a secondary importance from the point of view of the working class, show a realitive sharpness. Because the combat for getting a share from exploitation becomes more acute. After the September 12 coup, the imperialist exploitation has increased such an extent that it decreased the share of the capitalist sections in the exploitation except a handful of oligarchy. Moreover, the economical crisis which creates increasingly growing danger of collapse threatens even the big bourgeoisie. Hence increasing inner contradictions of the bourgeoisie

On the other hand, the working class was exhausted in the pre-reaction period and at the same time has been subjected to a severe terror of the reaction. The process of its gaining strength and also perceiving the lessons of the period through its experiences has began. The policy should take into consideration this fact as well. The working class remains idle for a certain time. Active sections due to various reasons can appear in petty bourgeois sections, in middle strata. It is necessary to pay particular attention to them and to conduct a policy that brings them closer to the working class. Not taking that into account means to drive the working class into the battle field alone and tiresome. That always can not be done anyway. On the other hand, looking at the temporary immobility, loosing the confidence in the working class means to loose the revolutionary logic. From all we have said, of course such a conclusion should not drawn as we suggest that the workers should not do anything against the dictatorship. On the contrary, all out efforts should be made in order to revive each single action.

The 4th Plenary meeting of the CPT CC stated substantially all what we said now. Our slogan "democratic Turkey and stronger CPT" explains this. We considered further reinforcement of the CPT in the struggle for democracy and in its connection with the conditions of more powerful struggle of the masses for democracy.

Therefore, maturity of the subjective factor at present is closely linked with the task of restoration of democracy. Maturity of the subjective factor is necessary for the revolution. If one does not pay attention to the problem of democracy which means free expansion of the class struggle, how can we imagine under these conditions to form the army of revolution by organizing one by one millions of working people, peasants, intellectuals even the workers?

Do we have realistic observations about particularly in the peasantry, on the

power of whole left? Not understanding them all at the same time means not understanding why the democratic stage of the revolution is needed.

"The degree of Russia's economic development (an objective condition) and the degree of class consciousness and organisation of broad masses of the proletariat (a subjective condition inseparably bound up with the objective condition) make the immediate and complete emancipation of the working class impossible...a socialist revolution is out of the question unless the masses become class conscious and organised, trained and educated in an open struggle against the entire bourgeoisie. Replying to the anarchists' objections that we are putting off the socialist revolution, we say : we are not putting it off, but we are taking the first step towards it in the only possible way, along the only correct path, the path of a democratic republic. Whoever wants to reach socialism by any other path than that of political democracy, will inevitably arrive at conclusions that are absurd and reactionary both in the economic and the political sense. If any workers ask us at the appropriate moment why we should not go ahead and carry our maximum programme we shall answer by pointing out how far from socialism the masses of the democratically minded people still are, how undeveloped class antagonisms still are, and how unorganised the proletarians still are. Organise hundreds of thousands of workers all over Russia, get the millions to sympathize with our programme! Try to do this without confining yourselves to high sounding but hollow anarchist phrases and you will see at once that achievement of this organisation and the spread of this socialist enlightenment depend on the fullest possible achievement of democratic transformations." (1)

Our subject is democracy but let us go back to the beginning.

FACTS, TENDENCIES AND THE REVOLUTIONARY POLICY

When the CPT pointed out that the reactionary dictatorship was transformed into a fascist dictatorship, it drew attention to two points: Firstly, it underlined that today's dependent fascism was objectively weak but at the same time it also stated that such a regime was needed by imperialism and by the collaborating oligarchy. Moving from this point it noted that the regime takes into opposition very broad forces and such a regime could only be overthrown by a nation wide resistance, through hard struggles.

The fascist character of the dictatorship its objective weakness would lead to further shrinkage of its basis. And so did it happen. As dictatorship, felt its gradual weakening, wanted to strengthen itself and to re-gain its basis with the help of the ploy of "returning to democracy". "The peculiarity of the present situation is intertwining of the efforts of the dictatorship to institutionalize with its weakening and therefore appearance of a process with two interacting and interdependent aspects. As a consequence, the dictatorship tries to apply both methods imposed by this contradicting double-sided process. These are the manoeuvre of "transition into a democratic regime" and the methods of repression and terror" (2). As we have stated long ago, the dictatorship itself opened a hole on its walls. CPT announced that the allegation of "returning to a democratic regime" was a ploy but it did not confine itself only to this fact, it underlined the need for making use of this manoeuvre. It took into consideration

making the hole bigger. Because as bigger as this hole gets, the wind of democracy would blow stronger, conditions helping the mass actions to raise would increase and the requisites of the nation wide resistance would be prepared.

Now all attentions had to be focused onto the concrete facts and without missing not a single new fact; all had to find their reflection in our political tactics. Flexible tactics does not mean such a policy that sounds well and can be accepted by everyone. Certainly not! It means a capacity to embrace all kinds of new phenomena with concrete developments, to be able to adjust itself rapidly to any new situation. What would give strength to the party following the period of recovery was advancing the political tactics up to the capacity of power of being able to change the situation. Today, our party's policy obviously makes a rapid progress towards such a level of maturity.

Our party stated the necessity of the unity of all anti-dictatorship, democratic forces for overthrow of the fascist dictatorship. During the local elections on March 25, 1984, our party put forward the tactic of "unity of all anti-dictatorial forces in the elections". Outcome of the local elections justified this tactic.

The concept of "anti-dictatorship forces" gained a real content with the election results. With other words, at a first glance on the basis of the existence of such potential forces, this concept meant characterization of the process objectively, noting a tendency but yet it was not the fact itself. After the local elections the tendency presented itself as a real phenomenon. Non-parliamentarian bourgeois opposition parties emerged as a force to be taken into account.

Anti-dictatorship forces was a phenomenon but that has not yet fully coincided with the definition of "all democratic forces". This phenomenon had to be evaluated carefully. And so we did.

"From the point democracy, local election results did not bring along an important development. Because the unity of anti-dictatorship forces and the people taking part in active struggles had not been achieved, it did not lead to a positive development in the political situation. Nevertheless, these forces did not retreat before the Evren-Özal duet, on the contrary, they consolidated their positions." (3)

Each force in opposition to the dictatorship and causing its weakening objectively serves for democracy, but it is not possible to note beforehand that how willingly and determined it is on the matter of democracy. We did not intend to make a strict definition without seeing such developments. But we indicated the tendency. "During the local elections, all anti-dictatorship forces succeeded to hit the same target... all these show the possibility of taking advanced steps along this way and possibility of rising an organised opposition." (4)

We put forward the necessity of early elections when we were not even talking about bourgeois opposition parties. We proposed early elections, to have a national democratic dialogue on the basis of taking a stand against the dictatorship and restoration of democracy. Some of our friends in the left did not understand this. They raised the question wrongly. They said: Does the early elections bring about overthrow of the dictatorship? They thought we gave up the aim of "nation wide resistance".

When the question is put forward wrongly, the reply comes wrongly. The correct question however was the following: Can the early elections become a useful weapon in the struggle for democracy? "

The CPT had caught the contradiction fully and rightly. Now the conf -

lict between the dictatorship and the opposing forces would become sharper. The dictatorship would try to attract the bourgeois opposition into reconciliation with itself. The most effective way of preventing this to happen was to come against the sham parliament and against its government, to raise the demand for early elections. The demand for early elections even itself would increase the instability of the fascist dictatorship. It would drag its external support (especially financial circles) into a dilemma. So did it happen. On the other hand, it would be an important weapon for increase of the political activity of the masses and actually that was the purpose. If we thought that the consequence of early elections was to be the collapse of the dictatorship, we could at least put forward this demand much later.

Some had the opinion that the demand for early elections would create parliamentary dreams among the masses. Those who have this idea in their mind without even thinking about looking at the participation of the masses in the elections-even if it was carried out with the force of the bayonets-imagined that the masses left aside the parliamentary thoughts. They have forgotten the well-known advice of Lenin. Actually however the one who was afraid of the bourgeois parliament was the dictatorship. Later that became more apparent.

The only way for the bourgeoisie to resist against the repression of the dictatorship was going into a cooperation among themselves and a cooperation with the left forces. As a minimum common platform on democracy was not clear yet, we considered the matter of early elections as a convenient base for a national dialogue to be sufficient. But later, as well as a common view around the demand for early elections was already formed, we have witnessed further developments. The demand for early elections while not losing its significance, in this connection fulfilled its function (to be the basis of a dialogue). Now appears a possibility of a dialogue directly on the basis of democracy.

The anti-dictatorship line raised up to the level of those who want democracy. With other words, the tendency has become a new phenomena. For that reason, it should be seen without any hesitation that separation line moved from the level between the dictatorship and those opposing it to the level of democracy and its opponents. With other words, opposition to the dictatorship gained a concrete content.

"Many views which we have been advocating from the beginning are now shared by broad circles. As the bankruptcy of the policies conducted for five years are exhibited, the view on the necessity for Turkey to choose a new path for itself gains gravity. Majority of politically active forces of the society sees the following truth more clearly: Today our country above all is in the need of democracy not only for its progress but also to keep on its foot, to take a breath" (5)

If the CPT makes an emphasis on the subject of the Righteous Path Party, (DYP, one of the anti-dictatorship parties outside the parliament) that is due to its being the determining factor in visualization of the above mentioned differentiation, not because it has the mission of restoring democracy. On the other hand, from the point of the left, the Social Democracy Party (SODEP) was already a close democratic force. Nonetheless, it was also necessary to see its concrete steps in that direction. But the case of the DYP is different. Because of the concrete situation, we have considered it among the anti-dictatorship forces. But we did not declared through a mechanical approach that it could not

take place among the democratic forces. Its occupation would be determined by its position towards democracy. In the light of the developments, we can say there are important circles in the ranks of this party, who demand democracy. To understand this, one should assimilate the subject of "democracy". We shall deal with it now.

It should be understood from all we have said up to now that the tactics of the CPT are dynamic and revolutionary tactics that do not confuse the phenomena and the tendencies in a concrete situation, continuously advancing, following the situation and developing it. The "general" analysis of the process based on the developments helps us to recognize the tendency. But if you take the tendency as a phenomena, you produce such policies that have no real forces yet, set them on hollow phrases and without any target. At the same time, you can neither understand nor make assessment on the phenomena, you close your eyes to them.

If we can not succeed to utilize the dialectical way of thinking in the life, then it becomes unavoidable to be dragged into oftenly made mistake. We forget the fact that the phenomena constitute the processes and grasping fully the progress lead to conceive of the phenomena. Then we are deserved to the following criticism of Lenin: "... a most obvious symptom of metaphysics... as long as people did not know how to set about studying the facts, they always invent a priori general theories, which were always sterile." (6)

TO INCREASE THE EFFICACY OF THE LEFT IN THE DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT

Let us move from a concrete basis and see the link between the political tactics of our party and its strategy. We must warn beforehand that absolutization of the difference between the tactics and the strategy would be wrong. In order to understand the entirety it is necessary to pay attention to the differences.

In order to see this link correctly, we should get rid of some fundamental ideological mistakes in the left that have been inherited from the past. These are mainly some basic mistakes in connection with the infantile disorder of Marxism. These are "subjectivism" or "voluntarism" and the concept of "class against a class" stemming from this foundation and also in this relation "economism" or "anarchist or semi-anarchist" deviations. These illnesses on the question of democracy in practice cause emergence of non-cited, distorted understandings.

Often, we in the left frequently use the labels such as "right opportunism" or "left opportunism" against each other. Actually these thoughts which we characterize so, do not even deserve such definitions. Because the danger is the progressing movement to the "right" or to the "left". These concepts do not mean much if you are standing still. Therefore, in our opinion, the real threat is posed by those views no matter whether it has a right or left character, keeping the left movement (and the masses) outside the politics and in general sectarianism and pacifism. Phrase mongering also means pacifism.

Strategical objectives and the ultimate aim have certainties. There can not be absolute certainties in the current policies. We can not make a guess today on which path the establishment of proletarian dictatorship will follow, through

which concrete stages and in which concrete form. But the proletarian dictatorship (or democracy), socialism is not a "possible" objective but an absolute certainty. Because the historical conditions and the regularities of capitalism imposes that.

And in the daily policy, the regularities take shape by a series of "accidental" events, social regularities take us to the ultimate aim, through them, but not in an "accidental" way. In other words, the current policy must take into account the possibilities. For that reason, the revolutionary policy has to pursue path of a class struggle, such a path with chances, facts, ups and downs, zigzags, sometimes stepping back, sometimes jumping over few kilometres at once. On the other hand, while the policy remains open to the possibilities it can not be set only on them. On the contrary, it can have a relative certainty. The policy should be an arrow with a sharp point that hits the target directly.

This contradiction can only be resolved by the science and art and skill of the politics. The method here necessitates double sided research and examination-practice and theory. The politics is a bridge connecting them. Again we learn from Lenin, from the great teacher. He advises us "first put socialism above all and then link everything to it". But in order not to simplify this advice, one should learn well the art of politics from the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. They are the examples for the correct use of the principles and the theory in the practical struggle.

Some have the opinion that by putting forward the aim of national democracy, the CPT creates a new stage in between and extends the path, produces disruption in the revolutionary process. Such a way of thinking, leave alone its theoretical incorrectness, carries the simple mistake of mathematical thinking. We are not talking about something that does not exist before the class struggle but, a concrete task to be solved. In the past, we were also evaluating the events in a similar manner that of almost the whole left movement. "The aim is to establish socialism, meanwhile there is a democratic stage, an obligatory stage in between. That is all."

One of our friends, in his critique about our National Democracy Programme says: In order to overthrow fascism, it is necessary above all to break the military-bureaucratic bourgeois state mechanism as a prerequisite of every real popular revolution" (7)

Obviously, our programme can not be understood with such an ideological weakness. Our readers would not forgive us if we replied this question. In this sentence, the words of "above all" are excess. Because when the advocates of this view have already established the proletarian dictatorship and broken the bourgeois state mechanism, is there anything left for "above all"?

Let us note here that the socialist revolution, a single process with two stages passes through a series of stages and periods. Up to the most matured and to the highest level of a qualitative change, quantitative changes and a series of revolutionary leaps qualitative changes take place in the revolutionary process. Connection of all periods and stages is possible only by strengthening the working class, the vanguard of the revolutionary process, undertaking the tasks of each stage and its struggle. Nothing can be linked to each other in the actual life just by saying on the paper we "have connected" The correct revolutionary strategy and tactics are those which strengthen the working class, provides it to raise its level of consciousness and organisation, to be able to fulfil the tasks of the concrete periods and stages.

National democracy is the way of approaching the revolution. We are follo-

wing the advice of Lenin, the task of the revolutionaries to search and find the way of approaching the revolution in accordance with the peculiarities of the country. Therefore, the national democracy is the product of our efforts for creative application of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism on our national soil. It is the most correct and clear reply to the question of what kind of democracy. We mean to say when this objective is materialized there will be a radical, qualitative change as we have noted above about the periods and stages.

Let us enlighten another confusing matter here. The 4th Plenary Meeting of the CPT CC dealt with the target of "restoration of democracy". That also should be seen exactly in the same frame. We are moving step by step from our ultimate aim, socialism towards the present day by concretion, by determining the intermediary stops to take us to the main point. Of course our aim is extension of democracy. Our chief objective however is to reach proletarian democracy. But today there is the task of overthrow of the fascist dictatorship and restoration democracy before us which should not be ignored. The task is not yet the task of broadening out democracy. But as we get closer to the present, it becomes an unavoidable necessity to take into consideration the views

and inclinations of the forces outside us outside the working class, and the real situation with all its aspects. The opposite would be an unforgivable mistake.

Beside us, there are diverse forces wanting democracy also. We do not impose our demands and views onto them. Neither we can give up our own views. But moving from the society's consciousness of democracy, we can try to elevate it up to our level.

Our understanding of national democracy, is the response for what is desired by the people under the present conditions of the country. Such type of democracy will not be practiced without materialization of the demands put forward in our programme. If there are some who also share a part of it already, surely we will be together with them, we shall support them without hesitation.

Secondly, we are not mixing up two things, what "should be" and what is "actual". We see the possibilities for overthrow of the fascist dictatorship through a mass popular movement, by nationwide resistance. As we have explained, we are getting prepared step by step for this. On the other hand, we do not exclude other possibilities. We are trying to choke the way of "retreat" of the fascist dictatorship, the prolonged and painful path towards its end. When the dictatorship becomes unable to maintain the regime as it is now, then it bases its ploys on "withdrawal-removal". In that case only the swords and uniforms will be out of vision, that will be the only change (let us note here, our advocates of 'civilian society' are also wrong for serving for such a way, even if they are unaware of it).

If they succeed taming, integrating the bourgeois opposition parties particularly the DYP to the regime this danger will grow. For instance, that would mean a government based on DYP-ANAP coalition, to be formed as a result of some elections, in reconciliation with the regime and become an integral part of it. From today, from the beginning, we draw attentions to a serious danger that can appear following the elections either an early one or in time.

On the other hand, a government of the DYP- only in a concrete situation and with the condition of saying definitely- may lead to disintegration of the fascist regime. Cooperation of the DYP with SODEP also mean a disintegration

(more rapid disintegration). In such a situation whether to call the government to be formed a "democratic government" or not will then be certain. Some other possibilities also can come onto the agenda. We can not ignore these possibilities. It is obvious that such type of democracy and a government will neither be national democracy nor a national democratic government. Only a part of the task of restoration democracy will be fulfilled, as the total democratization of the state, lift of the danger of fascism has not realized, the struggle for national democracy will continue. Those who do not take into consideration this fact, not understanding the importance of a cooperation between DYP and SODEP against the dictatorship, close their eyes to the possibility of the DYP to be driven into reconciliation with the dictatorship hence an opportunity for the dictatorship to make a manoeuvre.

As a summary, we do not consider a serious possibility of overthrow of fascism and restoration of democracy that is desired by the people, through a simple, ordinary change of government, through some section of the bourgeoisie taking the power.

On the other hand, raising voice of the bourgeois opposition does not indicate a softening in the regime. There are objective factors connected with the economical situation and external political commitments that enforce the dictatorship not to give any compromises. If the democratic opposition does not take determined steps, if the left forces do not find the way of cooperation with other democratic forces, if the political activity of the people is not escalated, the dictatorship can smash the democratic opposition or it can tame it. From that angle, the demonstration organised by the Social Democratic Party in Istanbul should be assessed as a cauregeous demarche.

On the other hand, we highly appreciate the fact that today diverse sections of the bourgeoisie have put forward a minimum common platform on democracy. We support this without any hesitation. We say that this development should be examined multisidedly as a new development, a new fact in the history of the country. We draw attentions to the fact that with molded thoughts, the processes of social development can not be understood and one can not be a vanguard.

Starting from a concrete situation, we are trying to give direction the development, the process of democracy and the consciousness on democracy towards our objective of national democracy.

At present there are two different platforms on democracy. The first is the minimum common platform rallying bourgeois opposition. That can be summarized as follows: 1: opposition to the dictatorship and demand for early elections, 2: recognition of democratic rights and freedoms in the extent of western countries 3: Change of 1982 constitution 4: opposition to militarism 5: conducting realistic foreign policy in the region and towards our neighbours, favouring peace and detente. 6: not submitting the impositions of the IMF.

The second is the platform proposed by the Left Unity, a comprehensive and consistent democracy platform. Its demands and objectives are known. The platform of the left unity and the first platform have some common points.

These two developments are two important facts of our history that should be neither underestimated nor overjumped. We know that the bourgeois opposition is not homogeneous, bears contradictations and can make turnings. The task of preventing this and bringing close these two platforms is the task of the communists and other consistent democrats. That is in line with the interests of

all democratic forces. Because "in order not to be caught by the storms, the opposition forces must have a common view not only on achievement of the democratic rights and freedoms but also on fundamental tasks such as overcoming the economical crisis, introducing social justice, taking effective measures against unemployment, industrialization and defence of national sovereignty and independence." (8)

Now the task is to bring closer these two platforms by broadening the common points and to increase the influence of the left on the democratic movement. It is attracting the masses into the struggle. Therefore it is creating the required potential for overthrow the dictatorship.

The CPT pursues such a concrete, realistic and revolutionary political line.

II

Now we can go down to the theoretical foundations of our National Democracy Programme and of our current policy. In this section of the article, we shall deal mainly with the classical foundations. On the question of democracy, instead of our views, we shall mainly try to show Lenin's approach.

Firstly, let us point out one of the chief mistakes of the left to be corrected, which we mentioned above, "narrow class" outlook, the concept of "class versus class". In other words, an understanding of "on the one hand is the army of the proletariat, on the opposite the army of the bourgeoisie and the class struggle is a battle between these two armies", perhaps it is not expressed exactly in these words but as appears clearly in the writings and approaches, it is a distorted understanding that vulgarizes the class struggle, and reduces it to a simple form.

Basing itself on such an understanding, the phrases of "interests of the working class", "the class view" and "class compass" are frequently used without their meaning. When they talk about the "interests of the working class" they only mean "to make a revolution" or a struggle for "economical rights". Such an understanding does not exist in Marxism.

This confusion stems from not paying attention to the theory of Lenin on "nations and national relations", which has been considered very little by left movement.

No fact or concept can be grasped if it is not considered in its contraversion and in its connections. "the class feature" can only be perceived in its connection with the "national" and the "international" with "national".

There are two types of relations at present: Social relations and national relations. Social relations are determined by the relations of production, distribution and consumption. In contact with the character of the production, when it is said social, it means the class relations.

National relations however while are based on the same foundation, they are relatively independent. If one talks about national relations, that reminds economy, politics, law, consciousness, culture, moral and ethnical characteristics. Class relations are built up on these factors.

Relations on national level have a change not only on the basis of economy but also as a result of a change in one of these or change of international relations.

One of the typical example of the opposite of this Leninist outlook is

Trotsky and Trotskyism. Trotsky could not see the class aspect in the national frame, rejected the role of the peasants and at the same time opposed the view of Comintern on "what is international can be practiced in the national frame" and put forward the theses saying that the international can exist without the national.

But what sort of a connection does exist between the level of development of capitalism and the relations on the national level?

Lenin wrote: "In these advanced countries (England, France, Germany etc.) the national problem was solved long ago, national unity outlived its purpose long ago, objectively, there are no 'general national tasks to be accomplished. hence, only in these countries it is possible now to 'blow up' national unity and establish class unity". The underdeveloped countries are a different matter. They embrace the whole of Eastern Europe and all the colonies and semi-colonies. In those areas as a rule, there still exists oppressed an capitalistically underdeveloped nations. Objectively, these nations still have general national tasks to accomplish, namely democratic tasks, the tasks of overthrowing oppression. (9)

Today in every country who is confronted with direct or indirect interference of imperialism there is a national question. These are the problems of peace, independence, democracy and the right of choosing its own destiny, its own regime.

In our days, imperialism has aggravated extraordinarily the contradictions of the capitalist society, including the contradictions on national level. The contradictions on both levels have a strong effect on each other.

Another point should not be forgotten: In the past, during the pre-imperialist period, national movements served for consolidation of capitalism. Today however the successes achieved in the national processes further aggravates the contradiction of capitalism. On the contrary, the successes of socialism not only presses capitalism in the corner and deepens its crises, but at the same time plays an effective role in the success of the national development and liberation processes.

The monopoly capital in a close tie with the international finance oligarchy disregards the will of the nation in those countries like ours, drags them into annihilation. In that case when the working class appears as a class or the only class who consistently defends the national interests and "the general national aims", shows the way of solution of the national problems, it is welcomed with the respect by the nation.

Therefore it can easily be understood that only by leaving aside the "narrow class" concept, "Trotskist" "semi-anarchist" or "economist" mistakes, the vanguard, the leading role of the working class can be grasped and can lead correctly towards the hegemony of the working class.

The Communist Manifesto says: "Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself the nation, it is so far, itself national though not in the bourgeois sense of the word" (10).

Historically the bourgeoisie has lost its feature of being the "vanguard of the nation". That does not however mean that it gives up this alleged role by itself in every country. If the proletariat does not stand for the role of being the vanguard class of the nation, the bourgeoisie will continue to present itself as a leader and deceive the people through chauvinism, national and social dema-

gogies. When Marx examined coup d'etat by Louiz Bonaparte in December of 1851, he said, under those conditions the bourgeoisie "had lost its capability of ruling the nation but the working class had not achieved yet".

The periods of national crisis are the critical periods for the working class to achieve this role. Because in such periods when the bourgeoisie claims that it is the vanguard, it is not convincing anymore. Periods of national crisis can appear as a consequence of an imperialist warfare, a deep economical, social crises and bankruptcy embracing the whole nation or of a fascist dictatorship.

For example, in the period of hitlerite fascism, national struggles had appeared in the developed capitalist countries against fascism and against the fascist intervention. The working class played the leading role, the role of safeguarding the entire nation. The communists guided the way to them and fought at the forefront. Not only the bourgeois parties but the social democrats were also dragged into a submissive policy and were in the state of not being able to defend the national interests.

"The Trotskyites too, like all other opportunists and revisionists, impeded the communists' efforts to forge national unity, to assure national freedom and independence. They espied a positive factor in nazi enslavement of European nations. They hoped that nazi brutality and Hitler's manhunting policy would ignite a proletarian revolution" (11)

As the national crisis deepens the fight between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat for the leadership of the nation sharpens. That means the class struggle takes the character of a struggle on the level of national relations. The opposite also can be considered. The national struggle gains a more clear class character. Democratic elements in the national consciousness increase and it gets closer to the class consciousness. This is the achievement of tremendous conditions for strengthening of the working class which is in a relatively weak position against the bourgeoisie, forming a broad alliance and accumulation of a huge revolutionary potential in the society.

If the working class does not come forward as the most decisive, the most true defender of the national interests, if it does not stand as an internationalist as well as a fervent patriotic force, it can never get prepared for its vanguard role. It is the task of the communist party to make the working class to undertake this role.

We can see that the National Democracy Programme of the CPT at the same time is the programme for preparation of the working class for the role of leadership, the vanguard, role for establishment of the political army of the revolution. We reject to repeat like a parrot, the words of "the leadership of the working class", we prepare it with a clear cut programme.

Today as it appears concretely, it is possible to form a national unity around the working class against imperialism, against the collaborating oligarchy.

Through this way, the Turkish nation will also be democratized. This is the process of replacement of the "capitalist nation" by a "socialist nation". Obviously, such a process of development is interlaced with the achievement of Kurdish people's all of its freedoms and in accordance with its national interests. The Turkish nation who fully recognizes the right of self determination of the Kurdish people and guarantees it with a democratic constitution, will therefore gain a democratic character. All we have said also means that the anti-imperialist democratic popular revolution will be triumphed by unity of the forces of both peoples.

Some take rather shallowly our definition of "national", without grasping the above mentioned depth. They suppose we are giving a mission of "saver" to the national bourgeoisie. Or some think we are considering the level of development of capitalism in our country rather backward and suggesting a strategy which can only be valid for some African countries and for those countries which there is almost no working class.

We however say just the opposite, the working class can be the vanguard of both, the national and social struggle. Nevertheless, our working class can play this role when it undertakes the tasks not only of the social liberation but also of the national liberation, We emphasize this point. It is clear that the future will be determined mainly by the solution of the tasks of social liberation.

Our party programme indicated the contradictions of dependent, relative backward capitalism in our country and stated the intertwining of the tasks of the national and social liberation and from the point of the working class, noted the existence of such a potential. "The main contradiction of capitalism, the contradiction between labour and capital is aggravated as a contradiction between the big monopoly bourgeoisie and the broad popular masses. This goes in hand with the sharpening of the contradiction between imperialism and the people of Turkey. The contradiction between the big landlords and the elements carrying the prints of pre-capitalism period with the broad masses of peasants takes place among the main contradictions which determines the social life. As a result of all these, the aggravation of the contradiction between on the one hand, imperialism and the collaborating oligarchy, on the other hand other social classes, strata and groups comes forefront. That is the contradiction which has to be resolved primarily in order to give way to social progress and to create the conditions for resolution of the main contradiction between the exploiters and the exploited." (12)

National nihilism is no less hostile and dangerous to the working class than bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalism. Firstly, it blurs the internationalist consciousness of the working class. Secondly, it disarms the communists the working class against chauvinist nationalism, prepares a useful material for anti-communism.

In our days, imperialism is also hostile to the rise of the national consciousness. It tries to replace cosmopolitism against the national consciousness. With other words, imperialism tries to weaken the concern about national independence, national culture and the good traditions of the people, to develop a way of thinking that is based on cultural and moral degeneration, on admiration of "the American way of life". For that reason, the communists are not afraid of rise of the consciousness. In order to strengthen and increase the democratic, progressive elements in thinking, they step up their ideological work.

Unfortunately, "national nihilism" is one of the ideological diseases in the left movement. We, the CPT consider the ideological and political fight against national nihilism as a pressing necessity for the left to gain an effective position in the society, in order to realise the leadership of the working class.

WHAT SHOULD BE THE ATTITUDE OF THE COMMUNISTS TOWARDS BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY?

Similar to the way the left considered the word of "national", it took a frightened approach towards the bourgeois democracy. Such fears are unconscious. Especially under the conditions of violation of democracy, such a fear today is like the fear of a person from water, who does not know how to swim. What to be told to those shortly is "stop being afraid and start to swim".

We can enlist incorrect approaches of the left on the matter of democracy as follows:

1: "Now the task of restoration of democracy is the task of liberal bourgeoisie".

2: "We fight for the proletarian democracy, not 'particularly' for the democracy".

3: "We can not expect democracy from the bourgeoisie"

The first approach sees the DYP as the representative of the "liberal bourgeoisie" gives it the mission of safeguarding democracy. In such a way that it has an imagination of persuading the DYP to socialism by "liberalization" of socialism.

We have already dealt with the incorrectness of the second.

Advocators of the third approach assume that the bourgeoisie can not defend democracy without betraying its own class interests. Its defence of democracy is only a lie. That is the mistake to focus attention. Because take the DYP for example, if it favours democracy it is due to its own class interests. In order to see this one should get rid of the mistake of taking mechanically the link between political stand and opinions and the class basis. The definition of "expecting democracy" actually means drawing the attentions from the main subject to somewhere else. Let us repeat, if you do not undertake today's tasks, even if you do not intend to do, you will be in the position of "expecting democracy" from the bourgeoisie.

When the people begin to defend democracy this drives the bourgeoisie into aggressiveness and brutality or if it is weak, then obliged to "bear" democracy.

The more important issue that should be understood is follows: Bourgeois democracy has to recognise the rights and freedoms formally. For example, the bourgeois democracy principally always finds the ways of "conciliation" with such a principle. It leaves on paper this principle through such laws regulating the capital market and having a democratic appearance and through practical implementations. Or it recognizes the right to strike but it restricts this right through laws or through a repression of the police. It declares a war through the means of press under its control against the workers and the trade unions, restricts the strikes by using its own economical power. That is the bourgeois democracy.

The position of the working class however is not based on the logic of "expecting democracy from the bourgeoisie". On the contrary, as it will not relinquish the bourgeoisie from championship of democracy, leads to the sections of the working class who yet do not have proletarian consciousness, being backward in the terms of consciousness on democracy to follow the bourgeoisie.

The bourgeois democracy is formal. But the formal democracy is not unimportant at all. By using these limited democratic liberties, the working class grasps the real content of the formal democracy of the bourgeoisie. It tells to the bourgeoisie: "If you say you are democrat, let us to have the right to strike."

Even though the right to strike is limited, when the working class begins to use this right the broad masses will be able to see the limitations. Gradually they will understand through their own experiences that the bourgeoisie would not really recognize the freedoms, the given liberties would not be sufficient for solution of their own problems, hence the necessity of changing the system. To put it more clearly, the bourgeoisie's approach towards democracy can not be exposed by telling the bourgeoisie who says "I will work for democracy", "no, you are reactionary and remain as you are!" but through the class struggle and the fight for achievement and use of the democratic rights and freedoms. For that reason it should evaluate each stand of the bourgeoisie favoring formal democracy.

Today, if the capitalist circles want democracy that is due to decrease of their share in the growing imperialist exploitation and exploitation of the collaborating oligarchy. That is the essence of it. On the other hand, some bourgeois circles whose future are linked to these lands can hold more consistent positions of the matter of democracy. If the working class and other toiling people by the increasing influence of the left forces defend democracy persistently with everything in their power, certain sections of the bourgeoisie can be compelled to "endure" a consistent democracy.

Yet there is another subject to be underlined in particular. The policy of advocating the cooperation, is a policy that opens the way for the unity of the working people from the below and for the unity in mass organisations, creating numerous opportunities for the communists and consistent democrats in their efforts for uniting the masses. This is the way of reaching broader masses.

Now, let us read Lenin's works: We can not give them all here but whoever read Lenin's works know that he drew attentions many times to, with his own saying: "the enormous significance of democracy". From the angle of paying attention to the various forms of bourgeois democracy, let us give a quotation from Lenin's works:

"We can not get out of the bourgeois democratic boundaries of the Russian Revolution. There is bourgeois democracy and bourgeois democracy. The Zemstvo monarchist is a bourgeois democrat too. The peasant who has taken up arms against the landlords and the government officials and with a "naiver republicanism" striking a bargain with tsarism is also a bourgeois democrat. There are bourgeois democratic regimes like the one in Germany, and also the one like in England, like the one in Austria... He would be a fine Marxist indeed, who in a period of democratic revolution failed to see this difference between the degree of democratism and the difference between its forms. (13)

All right, what should be the attitude of the working class to give support to everyone no matter which section of the bourgeoisie it comes from, who wages a struggle for democracy. The CPT call anti-dictatorship bourgeois opposition forces for a cooperation among themselves and the need to support their each progressive step and did what should be done. Some repeatedly point out the "independent policy of the working class" but speak very little about the present democratic tasks which they think would be shadowed. They strike a wrong target. While wanting the working class to put its full weight onto the

struggle for democracy, we do not forget the following:

"Obviously, under such conditions to call upon the worker to fight for political liberty would be equivalent to calling upon him to pull the chessnuts out of the fire for the progressive bourgeoisie, for it can not be denied that political liberty will primarily serve the interests of the bourgeoisie and will not ease the position of the workers... "Lenin continues:" political liberty will ease only the conditions for their struggle, against these very bourgeoisie." (14).

Therefore, no matter which part of the political liberties are concerned, the working class does not hesitate to give support to those who make efforts for them. If it is told to the working class in the frame of clear policies, who and why is to be supported, such a support multiplies the political vigilance of the working class.

In order to give a detailed reply to the wrong views on the question of democracy among the left let us return to Lenin's works:

A correspondent in the number 12 issue of *Iskra*, accused the Bolshevik paper of leaving the "class point of view" because it reflected all aspects of liberal discontent and protest. Then Lenin wrote the following:

"All these socialists forget that the interests of autocracy coincide only with certain interests of the propertied classes, and only under certain circumstances, frequently it happens that its interests do not coincide with the interests of these classes as a whole, but only with those certain of their strata. The interests of other bourgeois strata and more widely understood interests of the entire bourgeoisie, of the development of capitalism as a whole, necessarily give rise to a liberal opposition to the autocracy. The autocracy guarantees the bourgeois protection against socialism but since the people are deprived of rights, this protection is necessarily transformed into a system of policy outrages that rouse the indignation of the entire people. What the result of antagonistic tendencies is, what relative strength of conservative and liberal views, or trends among the bourgeoisie obtains at the present moment, can not be learned from a couple of general theses, for this depends on all the special features of the social and political situation at a given moment. To determine this, one must study the situation in detail and carefully watch all the conflicts with the government, no matter by what social stratum they are initiated. It is precisely the "class point of view" that makes it impermissible for a Social Democrat to remain indifferent to the discontent and the protest of the "Stakhoviches". Here Lenin reminds the sentence from the Communist Manifesto: "the bourgeoisie itself provides material for the political education of the proletariat by its struggle for power, by the conflicts of various strata and groups within it".

Lenin continues: "Let us recall also the words that the communists support every revolutionary movement against the existing system. Those words are often interpreted too narrowly, and are not taken to imply support for the liberal opposition. It must not be forgotten, however, that there are periods when every conflict with the government arising out of progressive social interests, however small, may under certain conditions (of which our support is one) flare up into a general conflagration." And Lenin goes on: "It is our direct duty to concern ourselves with every liberal question, to determine our Social Democrat attitude towards it, to help the proletariat to take an active part in its solution and to accomplish the solution in its own, proletarian way. Those who refrain from concerning themselves in this way (whatever their intentions) in actually leave the liberals in command, place in their hands

the political education of the workers, and concede the hegemony in the political struggle to elements which, the final analysis, are leaders of bourgeois democracy.

Let us continue to read: "It is particularly in regard to the political struggle that the "class point of view" demands that the proletariat give an impetus to every democratic movement. The political demands of working class democracy do not differ in principle from those of bourgeois democracy, they differ only in degree. It the struggle for economic emancipation, for the socialist revolution, the proletariat stands on a basis different in principle and it stands alone (the small producer will come to its aid only to the extent he enters, or is preparing to its ranks). In the struggle for political liberation, however, we have many allies, towards whom we must not remain indifferent. But while our allies in the bourgeois-democratic camp, in struggling for liberal reforms, will always glance back and seek to adjust matters so that they will be able, as before, "to eat well, sleep peacefully, and live merrily" at other people's expense, the proletariat will march forward to the end, without looking back... We will not forget however that if we want to push someone forward, we must continuously keep our hands on that someone's shoulders. The party of the proletariat must learn to catch every liberal just at the moment when he is prepared to move forward an inch, and make him move forward a yard. If he is obdurate, we will go forward without him and over him." (15)

In his article headed "working class and bourgeois democracy," Lenin states: "The question of the attitude of the Social Democrats, or the working class democrats, to the bourgeois democrats is an old and yet ever new question. It is old because it has been issue ever since the inception of Social Democracy. Its theoretical principles were elucidated in the Marxist literature, in the Communist Manifesto and in Capital. It is ever new because every step in the development of capitalist country produces a peculiar, original blending of different shades of bourgeois democracy and different trends within the socialist movement... On the one hand, the Economists in the Social Democratic movement were carried away by the semi-anarchist conception of a labour movement pure and simple, they regarded socialist support of the bourgeois opposition as a betrayal of the class point of view and declared bourgeois democracy in Russia to be a phantom. On the other hand, the Economists of the another shade, carried away by the selfsame idea of a labour movement pure and simple, accused the revolutionary Social Democrats of ignoring the social struggle against the autocracy which our liberals, Zemstvo men and uplifters wage... The proletarian wing expects no kindness from the bourgeoisie, but supports any, even the very worst bourgeoisie, to the extent that it actually fights tsarism."

"Both the Zemstvo people, who believe in qualified suffrage, and the Marshals of the Nobility are democrats, to the extent that they oppose autocracy and serfdom. Their democratism is limited, narrow and inconsistent, just as and all bourgeois democratism is one or another degree limited, narrow and inconsistent. ... Liberalism of whatever kind, merits support by the Social Democrats only to the extent that it actually opposes the autocracy. It is this support of all the inconsistent (i.e. bourgeois) democrats by the only really consistent democrat (i.e. proletariat that makes the idea of hegemony a reality. Only a petty-bourgeois huckster's idea of hegemony can conceive it as a compromise, mutual recognition, a matter of worded terms. From the proletarian point of view hegemony in a war goes to him who fights most energetically, who never misses

a chance to strike a blow at the enemy, who always suits the action to the word, who is therefore the ideological leader of the democratic forces, who criticises half-way policies of every kind. (here Lenin gives a foot note saying that a note for a shrewd new-iskrist: We shall probably be told that the energetic struggle of the proletariat without any terms will result in the theft of the fruits of victory by the bourgeoisie. Our reply to this is the question: What possible guarantee can there be for fulfilment of the proletariat's terms other than the independent force of the proletariat? (16)

There have been many changes since Lenin made these elaborations. Autocracy and fascism are not identical, and capitalism is not in the stage of development but in collapse. Escalation of capitalism into the monopoly state constituted not only the monopoly bourgeoisie but the bourgeoisie in general to become more reactionary. It became more difficult for the bourgeoisie to carry on its system of political hegemony through democratic institutions. Despite all, Lenin's principled views still keep their validity. On the other hand, now there are objective processes which compel the non-monopoly bourgeoisie and additionally the national bourgeoisie in the dependent countries to support democracy for their own sake. We have witnessed and are observing these in the recent years of Turkey. Due to the objective conditions, some sections of the bourgeoisie who have the tendency of favouring democracy but in the long term do not have the opportunity of holding the power in a bourgeois democratic regime are forced to demand democracy and that fact multiplies the opportunities of the working class as compared with the conditions concerned by Lenin. Today the international support of the working class is much more stronger. But if the working class does not utilize these opportunities, it will permit the bourgeoisie who "practically became reactionary" to deceive him in the name of democracy and persuade him to have a kind of democracy similar to pre-September 12 period. We offer our friends to have a discussion not on the frankness of the bourgeoisie on his demand for democracy but on what the working class and other working people must do in order to make the bourgeoisie "to bear democracy". We should not forget, as far as the bourgeoisie goes away from democracy, as tight as the working class should hold democracy

THE WAY OF TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM

Struggle for democracy is not the same as and identical to the struggle for democratic rights. The struggle for democracy is chiefly a fight against the political regime.

The political superstructure of a bourgeois dictatorship can take various forms. Either a democratic republic, an monarchy or a monarchy with elections, reactionary military dictatorship or a fascist dictatorship etc. It is not correct to put them on a par. We have seen above how Lenin takes into account even the slightest differences between them.

On the other hand, change of the political regime does not yet mean the change of the social system. It is a radical change in the balance of political forces in the frame of the capitalist system. It is a change of the balance of forces in favour of the progressive and democratic forces. Let us not here, in such a fight for a change, communists aim to change the system, to give an end to

capitalism and to establish socialism. The change of the political regime means preparation of its revolutionary requisite its political and class forces.

"socialism is impossible without democracy because. 1) the proletariat can not preform the socialist revolution unless it prepares for it by struggle for democracy, 2) victorious socialism cannot consolidate its victory and bring humanity to the withering away of the state without implementing full democracy." (17)

"Capitalism and imperialism can be overthrown only by economic revolution. They can not be overthrown by democratic transformations; even the most "ideal". But a proletariat not schooled in the struggle for democracy is incapable of performing an economic revolution." (18)

"...all the fundamental demands of political democracy are only partially "practicable" under imperialism... But from this it does not by any means follow that Social Democracy should reject the immediate and most determined struggle for all these demands-such a rejection would only play into the hands of the bourgeoisie and reaction-but, on the contrary, it follows that these demands must be formulated and put through in a revolutionary and not a reformist manner, going beyond the bounds of the bourgeois legality, breaking them down, going beyond speeches in the parliament and verbal protests, and drawing the masses into decisive action, extending and intensifying the struggle for every fundamental democratic demand up to a direct proletarian onslaught on the bourgeoisie, i.e. up to the socialist revolution that expropriates the bourgeoisie." (19)

Perhaps some will belittle the importance of changing the political regime or political democracy which by no means is a change in the social system yet, and they fail to see its connection with the change of a social system. They must think over the following: Is it possible to reach socialism through any other way than through the path of democracy, is there a single example for it?

In its essence, democracy is the materialization of the will of the majority. If the majority can not be mobilized for a democratic regime, is it possible to win them for socialism? Anti-communist propaganda of the bourgeoisie constantly disseminates the lie that the communists are after establishment. of a dictatorship of the minority therefore they are anti-democratic. The left who does not know how to be the master of democracy cauregeously, willingly or not presents a material for this propaganda. We however know that the proletarian democracy (dictatorship) is the most developed democracy, it is the freedom of whole people against a handful of exploiters. Who can be more democratic than the communists? One can arrive at socialism through the path of democracy and this path is democratic. The democratic path is not the equivalent of peaceful way. If bourgeoisie prohibits the peaceful way to the majority, every from of struggle chosen by the majority is democratic. That is why when we say the path for transition to socialism will be democratic, we are fully right. There has been no other way of transition to socialism. Why should we leave to the bourgeoisie being democratic? Is there any theoretical and logical reason for that?

The working class can not win the majority without waging a struggle for democracy . It can not be the vanguard, can not make the revolution. For example, today the question of winning the peasantry stands before the whole left. It is impossible to establish alliance just by repeating the question of the alliance of workers and the peasants. If you do not prepare the political con-

ditions for free dissemination of the class struggle among millions of people, how can you win them just through propaganda, work and through efforts of narrow organisations? In relation with the national question, we all talk about the right of secession of the Kurdish people. If one does not wage a struggle for creation of the conditions for the right of secession or annexation, is there any meaning of these words except sounding "sympathetic"? Or do all these are practiced only through a "revolution"? Will it be realised in socialism? Then (when the revolution is made somehow and socialism is established by some way) there will be no need for all these. The result is that: democratic rights of this type can not be achieved in the frame of capitalism anyway, in case of socialism, they will be practiced already.

Imperialism contradicts with bourgeois democracy, with the national struggle. But it does not mean that one can not find a way of reconciliation with them. No one can and do reconcile with them. This matter is related to the antagonism between politics and economy.

The economists claimed the impossibility of achievement of the bourgeois democratic rights and the right of self determination of the nations in the frame of capitalism. Lenin however showed that when it is suitable for imperialism, it allows the secession of small nations and their political independence when it suits its military and financial interests. After pointing out this, he asks: "Is that the way of discussing the political subjects to exagereate the finance capital in order not to signify the political matter?" This question also should be asked in our left movement.

Let us continue, imperialism can reconcile with democracy, so should we give up demanding democracy? "only those who cannot think straight or have no knowledge of Marxism will conclude: so there is no point in having a republic, no point in freedom of divorce, no point in democracy, no point in self-determination of nations. But Marxists know that democracy does not abolish class oppression. It only makes the class struggle more direct, wider, more open and pronounced, and that is what we need... The more democratic the system of government, the clearer will be the workers to see that the root evil is capitalism, not lack of rights." (20)

We can also understand from these words that the only aim for communists is not the question of achieving this or that right. That is not unimportant but if it is confined to this, than it would be a drive into reformism, the most frightened thing. The main question is the political struggle of the masses for these rights. Whoever restricts the consciousness of the masses with "rights", he either has an economist semi-anarchist or a reformist mind. Then, when you add the objective of "revolution", that addition does not hinder the working class to be prisoned in the boundaries of the bourgeois democracy.

How can we go beyond this frame? To win the masses into the struggle for political freedom and democracy in its every stage, to drive them into an active struggle. The struggle for democratic rights maintains its basis. In this connection, democracy is jobs, bread and freedom.

If it is not considered so, the question of which democratic rights "can be achieved" which ones can not occurs in mind. We do not put forward immediate demands according to the criteria of "possibility of achieving them". Today we focus our attentions on which demands can attract the broad masses and political forces into the struggle and unites them. For instance, we do not consider the right of self determination and secession is a right that can not be

raised in the frame of the capitalist system. But the reason why we did not include it among the immediate demands is due to above mentioned reason. It is the same for the matter of getting out of NATO.

There is another subject that can not be understood. We talk about the vanguard role of the working class in the struggle for national democracy. It will be a mistake if one bases himself on this and raises the question "since the working class comes into power, why don't you establish proletarian democracy?"

Leadership and hegemony is not the power of the proletariat itself. In the struggle for democracy, the working class undertakes the tasks of every stage of the struggle and gains efficacy and gradually gravity in the political life of the society. No one can presuppose the place and results of this gravity in the relations of political forces.

NATIONAL DEMOCRACY PAVES THE WAY

Up to now we tried to show the theoretical foundations of two elements of our national democracy programme, "national" and "democratic" elements. Of course, there is a lot to say on this matter. It is also important to deal with the new elaborations of the international communist movement. But it was necessary at first to start from the classical foundations. For that reason, perhaps we had to give quotation more than necessary.

We can further go through current theoretical question, the more important, on this foundations, we can deal with the specifics of our country, determined by historical and concrete conditions, specific aspects of the struggle for democracy, the concept of democracy and development of democratic institutions in our country. That will be the content of another article.

It should be clear from what we said up to now, the matter, the task on the focus of our attentions is the preparation of a mass popular movement and subsequently the revolutionary situation under the leadership of the working class.

No matter along what path the revolution advances restoration of democracy, revolution and socialism can be realized by constantly raising mass popular movements. The victory can be achieved by this way and only by this way the fruits of the victory can be preserved.

That is why the programme of the CPT and the policy of our party stemming from this programme is based on true "class point of view". The real class point of view, is the view of "proletarian internationalism", the highest stage of class consciousness.

No doubt that the firmest support to given to the international working class movement is realization of the political and social revolution in our country. But if we understand proletarian internationalism in this way only, it would be wrong and dissatisfactory contented, because proletarian internationalism can be reduced to a slogan which is shouted only during various celebrations. Moreover in some countries where they established socialism did not we witness nationalist tendencies? The typical example is Maoism.

A real proletarian internationalist movement is obviously closed to all variations of narrow class concept and nationalist tendencies.

Even though we leave aside the deepness of the matter of democracy, no doubt that it is in line with the interests of the international working class,

Turkish people and Kurdish people and also in line with the interests of other peoples of the region, to save our country from being an obstacle for peace, for national liberation and social progress and to make it a factor of peace in the region, to bring it at least to the position of a role played by non-aligned countries in the international politics. If such realities are not understood and not taken seriously, internationalism becomes an hallow phrase. Our peace and democracy programme is based on such firm foundations.

If the national and class characters of the struggle for national democracy are not in the form of their interrelation the desire of going beyond the limits of bourgeois democracy would be a hopeless expectation from the point of qualitative and quantitative strength of the working class. Even if their social contents differ today the majority of the people is discontented with the present situation and wants a change. This pressure does not only stems from the national corruption and disaster. But on this basis there are new factors and developments created by the historical process of development. Shortly these factors are intertwining of the tasks of national and social liberation struggle.

All national and democratic forces against the dictatorship and collaborating oligarchy, who were fighting alone yesterday can unite and create an enormous power for change of the situation. These forces are aware of the fact that they can not alone solve the deepening problems of the country. This situation gradually will become clearer. If our working class wages a struggle with a right political perspective, it can rally around broad forces. On this basis the class distinctions will be deepened further and the way will be paved for social liberation, the working class then elevates the revolutionary process up to a more mature level and our people will gain a huge accumulation of political an class potential that can change the historical destiny of the people.

Under the conditions of brutality and terror of the reaction our party sees this bright path extending from the present to the future. In our 65th year of foundation our belief in raising our party to a level that it becomes such a force that can change the situation is based on realities. That is why our belief will come true.

(1) V.I.Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 9, p. 28-29

(2) 3rd Plenary Meeting of the CPT CC, p. 19 (Turkish)

(3) 2nd Plenary Meeting of the CPT CC, p. 44 (Turkish)

(4) *ibid* p. 64

(5) 4th Plenary Meeting of the CPT CC p. 15 (Turkish)

(6) V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 1, p. 144

(7) Ş.Doğan, "General Critique of the Programme of the CPT"

Communist Publications, March 1985, p.19

(8) 4th Plenary Meeting of the CPT CC, p.36

(9) V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 23, p.59

(10) K.Marx, F.Engels, Selected Works, C.6, p. 502-503

(11) Leninism and the national question, CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism Progress Publishers, p. 172

(12) Programme of the CPT, p.26-27

(13) V.I.Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 9, p. 52

- (14) *ibid*, Vol. 1, p. 294
- (15) *ibid*, Vol. 5, p.339-343
- (16) *ibid*, Vol.8, p. 72-79
- (17) *ibid*, Vol. 23, p. 74
- (18) *ibid*, Vol. 23, p.25
- (19) *ibid*, Vol. 22. p. 145
- (20) *ibid*, Vol. 23, p. 73

